



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,396	08/06/2003	John H. Crowe	023070-150000US	1192
37490	7590	08/19/2005		
CARPENTER & KULAS, LLP 1900 EMBARCADERO ROAD SUITE 109 PALO ALTO, CA. 94303			EXAMINER DRODGE, JOSEPH W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1723	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/635,396

Applicant(s)

CROWE ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph W. Drodge

Art Unit

1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 1723

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-66 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of copending Application No. 10/635,795 in view of Wolkers et al publication "Human Platelets Loaded with Trehalose Survive Freeze-Drying. The instant claims substantially differ from the claims of '795, in omitting the limitation of the disposing being at a temperature of about 25degrees C or greater. However, Wolkers et al teach that blood cells optimize uptake of trehalose at temperatures about 37 degrees. It would have been obvious to the ordinarily skilled artisan to have practiced the method defined in the '795 claims while operating at a temperature of about 37 degrees C , as taught by Wolkers et al to optimize cell uptake.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1723

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3,12,23-28,39-43,45-55 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McHale patent 6,495,351. McHale discloses loading agents in the form of solutes from solutions into red blood cells (erthrocytes) using a combination of hypo- or hypo- osmotic pressure, osmotic shock, osmotic pulsing, dialysis and endocytosis (see especially column 6, line 49-column 7, line 2 and column 14, lines 41-43.

With regard to claims 2,23,24,39,40,46,54 and 66, solute concentrations and gradients are maintained and optimizing loading efficiencies are discussed at column 7, lines 52-54, column 9, lines 17-22, column 15, lines 32-35 and column 23, lines 48-51.

With regard to claims 2,4,26-28,39-43 and 45, the solute loaded may comprise an oligosaccharide as column 7, lines 64-67 teach agents optionally being in oligomer form and column 7, line 43 and column 19, lines 22-25 teach loading of glucose.

With regard to use of washing solution and washing buffer in claims 46-55, see column 15, lines 46-55.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beattie et al patent 5,827,741 in view of McHale patent 6,495,351 and the publication to Wolkers et al. With regard to independent claims 1,14,31 and 39, Beattie et al disclose loading of trehalose solute into blood cells such as platelets from solutions containing high concentrations of trehalose by utilizing concentration gradients (see the Abstract, column 3, lines 39-64, column 5, lines 48-57 and column 6, lines 35-43).

The claims differ in requiring that the loading be by the mechanism of hyperosmotic pressure or intracellular osmolarity. However, McHale teaches to load a

Art Unit: 1723

wide variety of agents into red blood cells and other blood cells by mechanisms including numerous forms of osmosis and osmolarity including hypo or hyperosmolarity, concentration gradients, osmotic shock, osmosis, dialysis and endocytosis (especially column 6, lines 59-67); while Wolkers et al teach at page 86 to load trehalose into blood platelet cells by endocytosis.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have augmented the Beattie et al method by using hyperosmotic pressure or intracellular osmolarity forces to load the agents, since McHale and Wolkers et al teach that such forms of loading agents into blood cells transfer agents rapidly into the cells and without damaging the cells.

Regarding claims 6-11, 14, 17-21, 24, 31, 32, 40, 48-53, 58-60, 62 and 63, Beattie at column 3, lines 54-64 disclose, in considerable detail a wide range of possible trehalose agent concentrations and hence concentration gradients across the cells that range from 10 mM to 15 M and also see column 4, lines 15-16 of Beattie et al regarding "concentration of trehalose in the solution not being critical and column 4, lines 31-34 concerning avoiding of eliminating a concentration gradient that would cause outward osmosis or diffusion out of the cell.

Regarding claims 47-65, washing steps and use of washing buffer are taught by Beattie et al at column 12, lines 54-56 and McHale at column 23, line 56-column 24, line 16.

Art Unit: 1723

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Drodge at telephone number 571-272-1140. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker, can be reached at 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the examining group where this application is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or Public PAIR, and through Private PAIR only for unpublished applications. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JWD

August 17, 2005


JOSEPH DRODGE
PRIMARY EXAMINER